



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,588	09/30/2003	Ruven E. Brooks	110003.00048.03SW195	5394
7590	07/28/2004		EXAMINER	
Susan M. Donahue Rockwell Automation, Inc. 704-P 1201 South Second Street Milwaukee, WI 53204				LE, JOHN H
				ART UNIT 2863
				PAPER NUMBER DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/674,588	BROOKS ET AL. <i>(A)</i>
Examiner	Art Unit	
John H Le	2863	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-34 and 70-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,16,17 and 70 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 3-15,18-34 and 71-74 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/30/2003.
 - 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 - 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 - 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Group I (Claims 1-34 and 70-74) in Paper mailed on 06/14/2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 35-69 and 75-79 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a non-elected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper mailed on 06/14/2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 16-17, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heimlich et al. (USP 5,903,886) in view of Hodorowski (USP 5,530,643).

Regarding claim 1, Heimlich et al. disclose a method for emulating an iterated process represented by a series of related tasks and a control mechanism that monitors and enables the iterative execution of those tasks until data associated with the process

identifying the components of the first type included in the first section of the first schematic (e.g. Col.11, lines 54-60);

Heimlich et al. fail to teach examining the second schematic to identify at least one instance of components of the second type that are associated with the identified components of the first type; and when at least one instance of components of the second type is identified, rendering the at least one instance accessible.

Hodorowski teaches examining the second schematic to identify at least one instance of components of the second type that are associated with the identified components of the first type (e.g. Col.18, lines 53-65, Col.28, line 51-Col.29, line 40); and when at least one instance of components of the second type is identified, rendering the at least one instance accessible (e.g. Col.31, lines 1-20).

Regarding claim 2, Hodorowski teaches the first and second schematics include schematic icons of first and second types, respectively, and wherein the step of identifying the components of the first type includes identifying the icons in the first section of the first schematic (e.g. Col.28, line 51-Col.29, line 40).

Regarding claim 16, Hodorowski teaches identifying the components of the first type included in the first section of the first schematic includes displaying at least a portion of the first schematic section via the interface and receiving a selection command via the interface (e.g. Col.17, lines 9-32).

Regarding claim 17, Hodorowski teaches rendering accessible includes displaying at least a portion of the second schematic section via the interface (e.g. Col.17, lines 34-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to inform examining the second schematic to identify at least one instance of components of the second type that are associated with the identified components of the first type as taught by Hodorowski in a method for emulating an iterated process represented by a series of related tasks and a control mechanism of Heimlich et al. for purpose of providing a highly distributed control architecture where each control module emulates a standard elemental electrical component (Hodorowski, Col.2, lines 45-51).

Regarding claim 70, Heimlich et al. teach a method for emulating an iterated process represented by a series of related tasks and a control mechanism that monitors and enables the iterative execution of those tasks until data associated with the process converges to predetermined goals or objectives, the method comprising the steps of: when at least one mechanical component is selected on the mechanical schematics, identifying components on the electrical schematics associated with the selected mechanical component on the mechanical schematic (e.g. Col.11, lines 54-60);

Heimlich et al. fail to teach providing a visual interface; displaying at least a segment of the mechanical schematics via the interface; and displaying at least the identified electrical components.

Hodorowski teaches providing a visual interface (visual display)(e.g. Col.17, lines 56-59); displaying at least a segment of the mechanical schematics via the interface; and displaying at least the identified electrical components (e.g. Col.18, lines 20-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to inform a visual interface; displaying at least a segment of the mechanical schematics via the interface; and displaying at least the identified electrical components as taught by Hodorowski in a method for emulating an iterated process represented by a series of related tasks and a control mechanism of Heimlich et al. for purpose of providing a highly distributed control architecture where each control module emulates a standard elemental electrical component (Hodorowski, Col.2, lines 45-51).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3-15, 18-34 and 71-74 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

In combination with other limitations of the claims, the cited prior arts fails to teach the step of providing a specification that associates icons of the first type with icons of the second type and wherein the step of examining the second schematic includes using the specification to identify icons of the second type that are associated with the identified icons of the first type and searching the second schematic for the identified icons of the second type, as recited in claim(s) 3.

In combination with other limitations of the claims, the cited prior arts fails to teach the second schematic section is part of a larger segment of the second schematic

and wherein the step of displaying the second section includes displaying the second section in a distinguishing fashion within the larger segment, as recited in claim(s) 18.

In combination with other limitations of the claims, the cited prior arts fails to teach for at least a sub-set of the identified components of the first type included in the first section of the first schematic there are at least two instances of the components of the second type that are associated with the identified components of the first type and wherein the step of rendering accessible includes indicating each of the at least two instances of the components of the second type, as recited in claim(s) 33.

In combination with other limitations of the claims, the cited prior arts fails to teach the step of providing a specification that associates electrical components with mechanical components controllable by the electrical components and wherein the step of identifying components on the electrical schematics includes using the specification to associate mechanical schematic components with electrical schematic components, as recited in claim(s) 71.

Other Prior Art

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

St. Clair et al. (USP 5,805,171) disclose a schematic display system for displaying selected areas of interest of a schematic includes a display screen, preprocessed display data stored in a data structure, and a digital processor for controlling the level of detail of the display in accordance with level of detail values reassigned to component primitives of the schematic objects

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John H Le whose telephone number is 571-272-2275. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Barlow can be reached on 571-272-2269. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John H. Le

Patent Examiner-Group 2863

July 20, 2004



John Barlow
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800